

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 23 of 2000

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE A.L.DAVE

- =====
1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed : NO
to see the judgements?
 2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO
 3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy : NO
of the judgement?
 4. Whether this case involves a substantial question : NO
of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution
of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?
 5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

DHANJI @ DHANRO MANJIBHAI MARVADO

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

Appearance:

MRS JYOTSNA K PATEL for Petitioner

MR KT DAVE, AGP, for Respondent No. 1, 2, 3

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE A.L.DAVE

Date of decision: 26/04/2000

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. This petition came to be registered on basis of an application received through jail from Dhanji @ Dhanoo Manjibhai Marvadi, who was detained by virtue of an order passed by the Commissioner of Police, Rajkot City, Rajkot. As legal aid was sought for, it was ordered to

be provided and Ms. J.K. Patel came to be appointed as legal aid Advocate. The matter has come up on board consistently for two days, learned advocate for the petitioner has chosen not to remain present. The matter is proceeded on merits in her absence.

2. Commissioner of Police, Ahmedabad City, Ahmedabad, passed an order on October 31, 1999, in exercise of powers under Section 3(1) of the Gujarat Prevention of Anti-Social Activities Act, 1985 ("PASA Act" for short), detaining the petitioner under the provisions of the said Act.

3. The detaining authority took into consideration six offences registered against the petitioner, so also the statements of two anonymous witnesses. The detaining authority considered the activities of the detenu observed that the petitioner is required to be immediately prevented from pursuing his anti-activities, which are detrimental to public order. The authority also considered the possibility of resorting to less drastic remedies and came to conclusion that detention under PASA Act is the only remedy that can be resorted to.

4. Mr. K.T. Dave, learned Assistant Government Pleader, has opposed this petition.

5. It appears, on perusal of the papers, that barring this statement in the grounds of detention, there is nothing to indicate an exercise having been undertaken by the detaining authority for verifying correctness and genuineness of the statements and the fear expressed by the witnesses. The detaining authority has to take into consideration the background, the antecedents, the character, etc. of the detenu while considering the need for exercise of powers under Section 9(2) of the PASA Act. The authority has to scale the right of the detenu of making an effective representation on the one hand and the public interest on the other and has to strike a balance between the two. The detaining authority has not filed any affidavit nor is there any contemporaneous material to indicate undertaking of such exercise by the detaining authority and, therefore, the exercise of powers under Section 9(2) of the PASA Act can be taken to have vitiated. No reliance, therefore, can be placed on these statements for sustaining the order of detention. There is improper exercise of powers under Section 9(2), as there is no material to indicate the exercise as stated above (*Bai Amina v. State of Gujarat & Ors.*, 1981 GLR 1186. *Gujarat & Ors.*, 1993(2) GLR 1659).

6. Adverting to the offences registered against the detenu, a perusal of the First Information Report and the other relevant documents supplied to the detenu makes it abundantly clear that each of the case is of an individual character and there was no disturbance to public order. All that was involved was a law and order situation. Resultantly, the satisfaction arrived at by the detaining authority about the activities of the detenu being detrimental to public order is without any basis. Neither the statements nor the registered offences can be accepted to form the basis of this satisfaction.

7. In view of the above discussion, the reliance placed on by the detaining authority on the statements of anonymous witnesses and the registered offences cannot be upheld. The order of detention as well as the continued detention both are rendered bad in law. The petition, therefore, deserves to be allowed.

8. In the result, the petition is allowed. The impugned order of detention dated October 31, 1999, passed against the detenu is hereby quashed. The detenu Dhanji @ Dhanoo Manjibhai Marvadi is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, if not required in any other matter. Rule is made absolute with no orders as to costs.

[A.L. DAVE, J.]

gt